

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,597	HILGERT, CHRISTOPH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J Kyle	3676	

All Participants:

(1) Michael J Kyle.

(2) Abraham Ronai.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 21 December 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

17, 18

Prior art documents discussed:

Jacobs, Pearlstein, Ueta

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed additional language to claims 17 and 18 to overcome the prior art and place the application into condition for allowance. Applicant's representative did not agree to the proposed changes. Examiner stated the rejection of claims 17 and 18 will be maintained in the next Office Action. The proposed language by the examiner included a limitation that the hydraulic fluid or medium is liquid at least under operating conditions. This limitation is similar to a limitation in claim 29 of the instant application.